



EDWIN H. CRABTREE
SUITE 57 S
3773 CHEWY CREEK N. DRIVE
DENVER CO 80209

COPY MAILED

JUN 22 2007

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Stephen M. Bisque et al.
Application No. 10/041,971
Filed: January 2, 2002
Attorney Docket No. **BISQUE-APP**

:
:
: **DECISION ON PETITION**
: **UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)**
:

This is a decision on the renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6), filed April 24, 2007 to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. §119(e) for the benefit of the prior-filed provisional application set forth in the concurrently filed amendment.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

A petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and must be filed during the pendency of the nonprovisional application. In addition, the petition must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(i) to the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

Additionally, the instant nonprovisional application must be pending at the time of filing of the reference to the prior-filed provisional application as required by 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(iii). Further, the nonprovisional application claiming the benefit of the prior-filed provisional application must have been filed within twelve months of the filing date of the prior-filed provisional application.


All of the above requirements having been satisfied, the late claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. §119(e) is accepted as being unintentionally delayed.

The granting of the petition to accept the delayed benefit claim to the prior-filed application under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) should not be construed as meaning that the instant application is entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the prior-filed application. In order for the instant application to be entitled to the benefit of the prior-filed application, all other requirements under 35 U.S.C. §119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(4) and (a)(5) must be met. Similarly, the fact that the corrected Filing Receipt accompanying this decision on petition includes the prior-filed application should not be construed as meaning that applicant is entitled to the claim for benefit of priority to the prior-filed application noted thereon. Accordingly, the examiner will, in due course, consider this benefit claim and determine whether the instant application is entitled to the benefit of the earlier filing date.

A corrected Filing Receipt, which includes the priority claim to the prior-filed provisional application, accompanies this decision on petition.

Any inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to Senior Petitions Attorney Patricia Faison-Ball at (571) 272-3212. All other inquiries concerning either the examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

The application is being forwarded to Technology Center AU 2179 for consideration by the examiner of the claim under 35 U.S.C. §119(e) for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed provisional application.


Nancy Johnson
Senior Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions

ATTACHMENT: Corrected Filing Receipt